

**Remarks**

This is in response to the Examiner's action mailed June 5, 2003. In that action the Examiner objected to the drawings and rejected claims 1 through 53, all claims currently pending. The Examiner further entered objections to claims 10 through 13, 15 through 23, 25, 27, and 33 through 44.

The Examiner objected to the drawings because reference numeral 122 was omitted from Figure 9. A corrected sheet of drawings including this reference numeral is submitted herewith.

The Examiner rejected claims 1 through 53 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicants regard as the invention. In particular, the Examiner states that "the phrase 'normal light' is unclear since neither the specification nor the drawing reveal what is meant by this." The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that this language is in any way unclear. Even without reference to the specification it would be clear to those of ordinary skill in the art that the phrase "normal light" means light that travels in a direction normal to the film. The term normal is well known in mathematical and technical disciplines to mean perpendicular. A copy of the definition of normal from *The Harper Collins Dictionary of Mathematics* (1991) is enclosed. Those of skill in the art would clearly recognize this meaning. Furthermore, the specification has extensive discussions regarding the reflectivity of the film for light incident normal to the film.

The Examiner further states that "the phrase 'at an angle of 60 degrees from normal' is unclear because the drawing does not show an angle of 60 degrees." The applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner that this is an appropriate basis on which to reject the claims. The references to normal and 60 degrees from normal do not relate to physical structures in the claimed invention, but rather to optical properties of the multilayer optical film. Specifically, claim 1, for example, requires that the film be capable of reflecting at least about 80% of the light that is

do lend themselves to showing in the drawings.

Finally the Examiner states that "For examining purposes, it is assumed that any incident light is polarized." The applicants do not use the term polarized light in the claims.

of the claims does not limit the angles at which light actually strikes the film. Instead it limits the film by specifying the reflectivity of the film for light striking at specified angles.

Clearly the present invention is not unclear in any way. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw all rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1 through 9, 14, 24, 26, 28 through 32 and 45 through 53 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as obvious in view of United States Patent 5,661,839 ("Whitehead"). However, the Whitehead patent is not prior art to the present application. The present application is a continuation of application 08/915,553 filed August 7, 1997 which was a continuation of application 08/494,981 filed June 26, 1995. The application on which the Whitehead patent issued was filed on March 22, 1996 with no claim of earlier priority. Thus the present application has an earlier priority date than the Whitehead patent so the Whitehead patent is not available as prior art to the present application.

Since the claims clearly define the invention and the invention is not obvious in view of the prior art, this application is in condition for allowance. The applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider the rejection of the claims and allow all claims currently pending.

Respectfully submitted,

October 6, 2003

Date

By:

  
Stephen W. Buckingham, Reg. No.: 30,035  
Telephone No.: (651) 733-3379

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833